

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The claims are 3-16, 20-40, 42-47, 50-55, 58-59, 61-65, and 68-98. Claims 10, 15, 31 and 77 have been amended to correct clerical errors noted therein and claim 94 has been amended to depend on claim 93. Reconsideration is expressly requested.

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the courtesy of a telephone interview on May 6, 2010, the substance of which is set forth herein and in the Interview Summary attached to the May 11, 2010 Office Action. As indicated therein, during the telephone interview, the Examiner inquired whether Applicant wished to make an oral election and the Examiner was requested to issue a written restriction requirement.

As stated above, Applicant elects Group I, claims 3-16, 20-40, 42-47, 50-55, 58-59, 61-65, 68-76, 86-91, and 95-98 (claim 94 having been amended herein to depend on claim 93) drawn to a method for further prosecution and respectfully traverses the requirement for restriction for the following reasons:

It is believed that any search for the invention embodied in Group I would necessarily include a search for the invention embodied in Group II. Thus, the simultaneous search for both

groups is believed not to constitute an unreasonable search for the Patent Examiner.

In addition, it is believed that the objectives of streamlined examination and compact prosecution would be promoted if a search were conducted simultaneously for both groups. Also, the necessity of filing multiple patent applications in this case does not serve to promote the public interest because of the extra expense that is involved, in filing fees and examination costs, as well as the burden upon the public, due to the necessity of searching through a multiplicity of patent files in order to find the complete range of the subject matter claimed in several different patents that could otherwise be found in one issued patent only.


Applicant reserves the right to file a divisional application for the non-elected group.

For all these reasons, it is respectfully requested that the restriction requirement under 35 U.S.C. 121 be withdrawn and that an action on the merits of all the claims be rendered.

In summary, claims 10, 15, 31, 77 and 94 have been amended and Group I, claims 3-16, 20-40, 42-47, 50-55, 58-59, 61-65, 68-76, 86-91, and 95-98 drawn to a method have been elected with traverse.

For all these reasons, it is respectfully requested that the restriction requirement under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372 be withdrawn and that an action on the merits of all the claims be rendered.


Respectfully submitted,
Andre HOFFMANN


Frederick J. Dorchak, Reg. No. 29,29
Edward J. Callaghan, Reg. No. 46,594
Attorneys for Applicant

COLLARD & ROE, P.C.
1077 Northern Boulevard
Roslyn, New York 11576
(516) 365-9802

FJD:pk

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on May 21, 2010.


Amy Klein

R:\Patents\HHOFFMANN, A-3 PCT\Response to Restriction Requirement.wpd